**Activity report**

Site: Lemo Woreda, Hosana Mobile Hotel

*I: Description of the activity*

What is the nature of the activity?

**IP meeting (2nd )**

What were the objectives of the activity **(Please explain the activity and why it was held)**?

* **To update and review the IP structure and function, and to discuss IP members role in future scaling up strategies**
* **To update IP members about Africa RISING research activities outputs, opportunities and challenges in the last one year**

Who organized/originated the activity?

**AR site coordinators, IP TG members and ILRI researchers**

Date of the activity **Feb. 02, 2015**

*II: Participation by IP actors in the activity (attach IP register for verification)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Number of organizations or actors grouped by the type of organization** | **Number** |
| Number of male farmers | 2 |
| Number of female farmers | - |
| Number of research organizations (Local and International) | 2 (Areka and Worabe RCs) |
| Number of policy organizations (including Zonal Woreda or kebele offices) | 6 |
| Number of NGOs | 1 |
| Number of farmer groups (clusters) represented | 3 |
| Number of private sector organizations | 3 |
| Number of other groups and specify (e.g. farmer organizations, women group, youth group etc.) | - |

*III: Narrative description of the activity (Around 300 words)*

Briefly describe the key elements of the activity-What went well and what did not go well?

**As this was the first innovation platform meeting after the establishment meeting, the IP structure and function at the Woreda and Kebele level was again presented and discussed with IP members. Since the IP establishment early last year a number of research activities have been going on the sites, so the IP meeting was used to present, discuss, reflect and gather feedbacks on the methodology and implementation process of the action research on the site.**

* **Strong and honest discussions were held where some implementation shortcomings from Africa RISING side around resource mobilization, coordination and methodological challenges in some protocols like PVS was raised. The number of farmers (only one farmer per commodity) on PVS trials was a major technical challenge raised by IP members**
* **Low representation of CG partners on the IP meeting was a challenge to give specific and appropriate answers to technical questions raised around protocols they lead.**

What key ‘next steps’ emerged from the activity

* **To share back major reflections from the IP meetings to protocol owners at ILRI campus.**
* **Initiating discussion on more involvement of local research centers in research after June 2015.**
* **Ask for each CG partners to delegate someone to participate, collect feedbacks and answer protocol related questions**